Volume LXXXV CHICAGO, March 25, 1920 Number 4

UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor 1880-1918

Philosophy has no faith in the efficacy of force in making people good. It teaches that people get better and improve, not by the destructive processes of hatred and wrath, but by the constructive method of love and reason. It teaches that goodness comes from within, not from without, that you can not beat goodness into people, or give them a prescription for it, to be taken in doses, like medicine, but that they must generate it out of their own hearts; and it believes that if we will only make social and economic conditions that will give all men, instead of a few men, a chance to live, they will naturally and inevitably become good. It teaches that you can not make people good by law, nor by policemen's clubs, nor by guns and bayonets, for it sees only hatred in these processes, and it knows that "hatred ceaseth not by hatred; hatred ceaseth but by love."

—*Brand Whitlock.*

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL—
Notes 51
A Unified Europe?—FRANCIS NEILSON 54
THE PULPIT—
Shall America Lose Her Soul?—REV. JOHN HERMAN RANDALL 57
CORRESPONDENCE—
Selected Readings for the Pulpit.—CHARLES W. WENDTE 61
CONTRIBUTED—
Anent the Suppression of Radicals.—REV. AXEL LUNDEBERG 62
Without an Enemy.—REV. ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY 62
POETRY—
Our Hidden Peace.—*F. L. Hosmer* 51
The Garden.—*Aline Kilmer* 56
Silence.—*Zona Gale* 56
The Dish-Washer.—*Amanda Hall* 61
THE FIELD—
Why Not Have Compulsory Military Training? —*Rev. Charles F. Dole* 63

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

ESTABLISHED 1878

$3.00 PER ANNUM.

With THE FREE RELIGIOUS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, THE CONGRESS OF RELIGIONS, and all other organizations and individuals seeking to widen fellowship and to realize the Brotherhood of the Spirit unrimmed by creed, form or sectarian prejudices.

EDITORS
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
FRANCIS NEILSON

ASSISTANT EDITOR
EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1. March 1, 1878. No. 1.

THE
Pamphlet Mission
FOR
FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER
IN
RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:
Robert Collyer, Chicago. Wm. C. Gannett, St. Paul.
Jenkin Ll. Jones, Janesville. C. W. Wendte, Cincinnati.
J. C. Learned, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.
Per Year, $1.50. Single Number, 10 Cents.

Frances L. Roberts, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. Sunderland, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
Geo. W. Cooke, Grand Haven, Mich., - } "Notes and News."

EDITORIAL CONTRIBUTORS
Charles E. Beals
Harry Foster Burns
Charles W. Casson
George Willis Cooke
Percy M. Dawson
Frank C. Doan
Charles F. Dole
James Waldo Fawcett
Zona Gale
Emil G. Hirsch
Chester Lloyd Jones
David Starr Jordan
George Grover Mills
George W. Nasmyth
Susan M. Quackenbush
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
Albert R. Vail
Arthur L. Weatherly
James H. West

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Boulevard, CHICAGO, ILL.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, January 12, 1899, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

Phone Oakland 489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES
Everything in
HARDWARE
AT
PORTER'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

WRIGHT & COMPANY
STEAM—DOMESTIC
COAL
TELEPHONE WABASH 5028
Main Office:
28 E. Jackson Blvd.
CHICAGO

KENWOOD FLORAL CO.
HENRY HILMERS, Prop.
Choice Plants and Cut Flowers
Phone Oakland 78. 1117 East 47th Street

Sample Copies of UNITY
Sent Upon Request

The Blakely-Oswald Printing Co.
PRINTERS and BINDERS
Telephone Wabash 3854 120-124 W. Polk St., CHICAGO

1902—One Wagon
1911—10 Wagons
and
FOUR AUTOMOBILES
We are patronized by those who desire and appreciate an excellent quality of laundry work.
Bissell Laundry Co.
Phone Douglas 1003
653-59 39th Street Chicago

Bowman Dairy Company
MILK BOTTLED IN THE COUNTRY
Milk Cream Butter Buttermilk
DO OUR WAGONS SERVE YOU?
WHY NOT HAVE THE BEST?
4221-4229 State Street Telephones at all Division Offices
EVANSTON CHICAGO OAK PARK

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOL. LXXXV THURSDAY, MARCH 25, 1920 NUMBER 4

OUR HIDDEN PEACE.

When shadows gather on our way,
Fast deepening as the night,
Be thou, O God, the spirit's stay,
Our inward Light!

Amid the outward toil and strife,
The world's dull roar and din,
Still speak thy word of higher life,
Thou Voice within!

When burdens sore upon us press,
And vexing cares increase,
Spring thou, a fount of quietness,
Our hidden Peace!

Though fond hopes fail, and joy depart,
And friends should faithless prove,
O save us from the bitter heart,
Indwelling Love!

The Thought of God. —*F. L. Hosmer.*

UNITY is glad to introduce to its readers a new and most interesting weekly visitor at its exchange table—*The Freeman*—published in New York by the B. W. Huebsch Company and edited by Francis Neilson and Albert Jay Nock, formerly of *The Nation.* The new periodical is of most attractive appearance with its twenty-four beautifully printed pages. Its contents include comment on current events, in both long and short metre, notes and critical studies of books and authors, and of musical, art and literary matters, poetry, a correspondence department, a theatre section and other valuable features. Among its signed contributions are articles by Walter Pritchard Eaton, William C. Bullitt, Gilbert Cannan, G. D. H. Cole and Hans Trausil. Next week we hope to give to our readers a more adequate survey of this brilliant new magazine. Meanwhile we hasten to extend greeting and welcome.

But four of the eight men who founded UNITY are still left at this, the beginning of its forty-third year. One of these, William C. Gannett, is just celebrating his eightieth birthday and UNITY must add its voice to the chorus of greetings. Quite as large as its late Senior Editor's, was Mr. Gannett's part in the origin and launching of this magazine, and with but one break of two years, his name has been upon its Publishing Committee or its list of Editorial Contributors from the first issue in March, 1878, until within the past year. Our older readers will recall the inestimable value of his constant contributions to the paper, of poetry and sermons, editorial notes and Sunday School lessons, Western Unitarian Conference reports and programs for the further success of the paper, his "statement of things commonly believed among us" and his compelling arguments in support of the wider fellowship and broader vision of the Western group. Indeed, so interwoven were his life and work and thought with those of UNITY's Editor from the days preceding the founding of the paper until long after the "Issue in the West" had done its work of broadening the entire basis of American Unitarianism, that it is impossible to speak or think of either man during that period without including the other. However they may have differed at times, there was between them a fundamental harmony and an abiding love that held them close together until death intervened. The beautiful hymns and services of the *Unity Hymns and Chorals,* by Gannett and Hosmer, still used weekly at All Souls Church, the literary union of their remarkable series of sermons in "The Faith that Makes Faithful," and Mr. Gannett's tribute in UNITY to his friend of so many years, are but outward symbols of that inward sympathy. It is impossible for us even faintly to suggest the tribute the Senior Editor would have paid his beloved brother on this happy occasion. UNITY can only voice its appreciation of his vision and leadership, his faithfulness and spiritual power, his lifelong devotion to the furtherance of the ideal, and above all the personality which reveals beyond the spoken word, the fineness of his conscience and the sweetness of his spirit. We wish for him and for the thousands who love him many more milestones on the long highway over which he has travelled on his beautiful and successful journey to serve humanity, promote "truth, righteousness and love in the world," and foster "freedom, fellowship and character in religion." S. M. Q.

It is pathetic, and yet infinitely inspiring, to see how, out of the awful wreckage of the war and its aftermath of "peace," high and noble spirits throughout the world are trying to build again the structure of internationalism. Henri Barbusse has founded "Clarté" and brought into its membership men of many countries. Romain Rolland has sent forth his world-wide appeal to intellectuals, and has received responses which give assurance of a sympathy which knows no longer the border-lines of race or country. And now comes George D. Herron, disillusioned of all his hopes of the Great War, repentant of his support of and part in the struggle, calling upon the young men and women of Europe to join a fraternity

of hands and hearts which shall bring a "better peace than Paris." Stirring is the call he sounds—

> Wherefore I wish that soon, rising from barracks and universities, from factories and farms, the young men and women who are looking for a better peace than Paris, for that fraternal peace which Paris prevented from becoming, would organize themselves into a Young Europe—into the Young Europe which Joseph Mazzini, first and sublimest of international statesmen, so vainly yet valorously essayed. I wish that, clasping hands across the frontiers, the youth of each nation would choose and anoint representatives to meet, either in Rome or Geneva, the chosen and anointed ones of other nations; and that these all, duly assembled and highly determined, would decree, as it would be in their power to do, the end of wars—or the end of the diplomacy through which the Appetites cause the wars to be. I wish, furthermore, that this resolved and consecrate Young Europe, permitting no political party to purloin and exploit its high purpose, would set before the nations the goal, also by Mazzini acclaimed, of universal association in freedom and universal freedom in association—the goal whence the world, ensphered in co-operative and creative good will, would advance through the years orchestrally, a veritable music of God.

Such movements seem pitifully weak to resist the machinations of the stupendous governmental organizations which now hold humanity in thrall. What can such bands of consecrated souls do to overcome the wiles of diplomacy, the might of armaments, the rivalries of economic systems, the fostered prejudices and hostilities of nations? And yet it is in such aspirations that we find the hope of the world today. The heart of man is hungry for universal fellowship, and will not forever be defeated.

The German counter-revolution is an event full of uncertain possibilities. It may be a flash in the pan, or on the other hand the beginning of another devouring European conflagration. Before these lines are printed almost anything may happen. The sudden uprising may be overthrown and the Ebert government be restored to power; the monarchy may be firmly re-established, in the person of some Hohenzollern, perhaps even the Kaiser himself; civil war may ensue, and Germany cast to a new depth of misery and horror; the French may invade German territory from the west, or the Bolsheviki from the east; the Soviet Germans and the Bolsheviki may join hands in one vast alliance against both the old Entente and the new German imperialists. Amid all the welter of confusion, only one thing is sure—and that is that in this latest catastrophe, we have only the perfect fruitage of the Paris Treaty. The "Big Four" undertook to give us peace in terms of vengeance, lust and hate, and they have given us what such passions always produce—new occasions for war. When the Germans got rid of their Kaiser and his ring of mad imperialists, established the socialist republic, and sued for mercy on the basis of the Fourteen Points, they did all that had been asked of them as a condition of peace. Had the Allies met them in a spirit of conciliation, and, without any neglect of justice, undertaken to write a clean and healing treaty, to the end not of the aggrandizement of the victors, but of the restoration of all of stricken Europe, the moderates of Germany would have been strengthened and their government made secure. As it was the Germans were humiliated, degraded, ravished by what Keynes well calls "a Carthaginian Peace." They were made to be desperate and hopeless men, and the Ebert regime a thing of weakness and shame. Under such circumstances, revolution either at the hands of the Sparticides or of the militarists was inevitable. The experience of Russia has been repeated the other way round. Again, because of the failure, or refusal, of the Allies to live up to their own professions of idealistic war-aims, they have brought upon the world "confusion worse confounded."

UNITY has for some time been making a specialty of printing the names and utterances of high-class leaders of opinion in this country who, under a fine disguise of law and order, present themselves as advocates of violence. General Leonard Wood, candidate for the Republican nomination for the Presidency, has figured prominently upon this list. We would now mention him again for dishonorable mention. Speaking the other day on the so-called "Red" menace, he declared that he had one remedy for revolutionary disturbers in America—"S. O. S.—shoot or ship!" We would like to comment somewhat at length upon the knowledge of human history and experience, which is revealed by this statement. We would enjoy dilating upon the elevation of moral sentiment and the wide range of human sympathy and understanding connoted by this doctrine. Especially would we like to emphasize the high degree of statesmanship manifested by this recommendation of policy on the part of one who is ambitious to serve as the chief magistrate of the Republic in a period dangerous and difficult beyond all precedent. But we forego all these temptations, in order to state our unmeasured indignation that it is possible in America for one man to say, not only with impunity but with applause, what would bring another man under immediate arrest and imprisonment. America is supposed to be a country of equal law, in the sense that this law shall be "no respecter of persons." We are told that there is just one thing today which the law will not tolerate, and that is criminal anarchy, or advocacy of violence against person and property. Thousands of obscure, friendless and unknown individuals are either in prison or under indictment because they are identified with sentiments which threaten to find expression in some form of physical force. And yet here is this distinguished army officer and political candidate going up and down the land advocating exactly these same sentiments which have brought so many under condemnation of the law. General Wood is

respectable, and those whom he would "shoot or ship" are outcasts. Hence he is immune! We call this situation a scandal of the first magnitude, and marvel that so few cry out against it.

Clamor for war with Mexico has temporarily subsided. In the lull thus happily permitted us for a little time, it may be well to call to mind the results of an investigation of the Mexican situation carried out a few weeks ago by the Chicago Federation of Churches. Three inflammatory reports were carefully run down by the Federation, and all of them found to be without foundation in fact. In addition the Federation discovered that American missionaries in Mexico are all opposed to intervention; that conditions in Mexico are far better than the newspaper reports indicate; that an organized attempt to force intervention seems to exist, to the end that American business interests, through permanent occupation, may be free to exploit the enormous natural wealth of the country in petroleum, minerals and agricultural lands. Furthermore, when the Federation undertook to publish these findings, it made the interesting discovery that the Chicago newspapers were unwilling to print the facts! Here is an illuminating situation—war between two friendly countries being deliberately fomented by selfish and dishonest propaganda, and the channels of public information deliberately closed to any statement of the truth! This is one more illustration of the thesis presented by Walter Lippman in his new book, "Freedom and the Press"—that the problem of free thought and free speech today is the wholly new problem of how to obtain the raw material for correct individual opinion.

The problem of our public schools becomes more and more serious every day. A report of the United States Bureau of Education shows that on February 13th last, 18,279 schools were closed because of lack of teachers, and 41,900 other schools were being taught by teachers characterized as "below the standard, but taken on temporarily in the emergency." Recent investigation in New York City revealed the fact that not less than 30,000 children were being sent to their homes each day, for lack of teachers to care for them. Nor does the future hold any prospect of improvement, as witness the reports from the normal schools. Thus in 190 state, county, city and private normal schools, representing 60 per cent of the normal schools of the country, there were enrolled in November, 1919, 11,503 fewer students than during the pre-war period. The reason for this calamitous situation is of course largely economic; teachers, like ministers, are no longer being paid a living wage. Thus the average salaries in this country in 1918 were, $606 for elementary teachers and $1031 for high school teachers. Wages for rural teachers fall far below this average, many localities showing payments as low as $150 and $200 a year. Under such conditions teachers cannot long be had—the law of survival forbids! But we wonder if there are not other factors than the economic involved in this situation also. What about the terrorization imposed upon our school teachers, the forced methods of so-called patriotic instruction, the denial of free exercise of thought and judgment? We do not see how any self-respecting teacher could endure the Prussianization of the school system now fully established, for example, in New York. That not only many teachers, but the best teachers, should be resigning, is inevitable. If American schools are to be turned into intellectual drill-grounds, we must train up a different set of teachers to do the ugly work. Our present generation still has left some memories of old-time freedom.

In a recent series of religious meetings at Yale College, which were attended by more than 2,000 students, the challenging question was again and again flung at the audiences, "If everywhere people acknowledge that the teachings of Christ are true, why do they not adopt them and live them in their own lives?" The answer to this query is that, in certain restricted fields of relationship, men have adopted and are living out the principles of Jesus. Walter Rauschenbusch made this fact plain in his "Christianizing the Social Order," when he pointed out that the home, the school and the church are great social institutions in which the teachings of the Nazarene are to some degree effective. And the remarkable thing is that, to the extent that they have been applied in the organization and practice of these institutions, the ideals of Christianity have been triumphantly successful! What we mean when we say that men do not practice the teachings of Christ which they profess, is that in certain great areas of social life, spiritual idealism of the Christian type is altogether excluded. These areas are first politics, second industry, and third internationalism. In these three fields, men are absolutely barbaric. The law of "tooth and claw" is everywhere dominant. And it is just in these fields, let it be said, that man is miserable, life insecure, and the world one vast calamity! The need of our time is that men shall extend to these far-flung fields of social relationships, the same controlling principles of moral and spiritual conduct, which they have already to some extent put into practice in the more restricted fields of home and school and church. That they do not do so is because of ignorance, lack of imagination, selfishness, above all fear. They dare not trust themselves to that open road of universal brotherhood which ever lies before. The words of

Jesus demand so absolute a surrender to the self-forgetting life, that few men have the courage or the wish to try it on a large scale. And yet it is here, and nowhere else, that salvation for mankind is to be found. The great affirmation is scientifically sound —"I am the Way, the Truth and the Life"!

The publication of Phillip Gibbs's "Now It Can Be Told," marks the appearance of another great war book. It is possible that a more horrible picture of war, a more terrific indictment of the men and nations guilty of war-making, has been written, but if so, we have not seen it. No less a paper than the New York *Times* prints a review of the volume in which it is declared that the English newspaper correspondent has even outdone Barbusse in his "Under Fire." Like Barbusse, Gibbs writes as one who has seen and knows, for he was at the front throughout the entire struggle, and his soul was plainly shaken to its depth. "This is war," he says, in pages that read like Dante's "Inferno," and make ridiculous all questions of blame and innocence. To talk about saving civilization by a process which is itself the destruction of civilization and the complete annihilation of man, is the crowning blasphemy. Fortunate are those who can read this book, and say, "Thank God, I took no part in this monstrous thing!"

A Unified Europe?

So that we may gravely consider the conditions which prevail in Europe, is it safe to say that we have reached a calm state of mind, that the last evidence of war fever has disappeared? Surely there are counter-irritants sufficient to mitigate the inflammatory dementia which afflicted so many of us. What Lord Robert Cecil called the war mind was really a complication of mental disorders of long growth; they were in us before the war began, lurking in our nervous systems which had become over-wrought by the evils of a civilization governed by fear. Fear drove Europe to war, and fear was responsible for the peace. And it is fear, strangely enough, which is now forcing us to realize the utter absurdity of the peace upon which so much time and energy were wasted, forcing us to recognize the fact that there can never be peace in Europe so long as the notions of the imperialists prevail. Why then have we been obliged to wait for nearly a year and a half to realize the utter impracticability of forcing on European peoples a conqueror's peace? It would be absurd for anyone to try to fix the blame of all this blundering upon the peoples who have been kept in ignorance of real conditions, who have been kept in a frenzy of hate, whose lowest instincts have been appealed to in the work of destruction and starvation. No, the people cannot be blamed for the conditions which prevail in Europe, conditions which threaten to strike at the very heart of our own legitimate economic and commercial power. The peace was indeed made in defiance of the better instincts of the peoples of Europe and America, for the armistice was arranged on the basis of the fourteen points, a basis flagrantly ignored by three or four politicians who are now utterly discredited.

The matter of the peace must be dealt with anew. in its entirety, and this time the people will undoubtedly have something to say about the terms. We shall have to look facts sternly in the face, and drop all senseless raving about crushing this and crushing that, because it must be patent to everybody that the crushing policy hits back with tremendous force. Like a boomerang, the crushing policy, covenant and treaty, descends swiftly upon our own heads. There was only one peace for Europe, and that was the peace European people expected, the peace of the fourteen points. Its author had the people of Europe in the palm of his hand, but he either did not know it, or learned from his imperial colleagues in Paris that the people did not know what was best for themselves. From those who were on the spot, but not invited to the conclaves, we learn that Messrs. Lloyd George and Clemenceau swiftly set to work to fence the President in, so that they could keep his wisest advisors out. It is not only Mr. John Maynard Keynes who makes this quite clear in his book, "The Economic Consequences of the Peace," but information of the same kind has been given to the world by numbers of other government officials who went to Paris believing that the peace to be made would be based upon the armistice terms which the militarists completely ignored—in the terms of occupation and surrender of material which they imposed on the conquered—without one word of protest being raised by Allied statesmen, who had consented to the peace being based upon the fourteen points.

Annoying as it may appear to the military mind a military peace settles nothing, because the military mind is not interested in peace. Indeed it is well-nigh impossible to get the military mind to understand the significance and importance of the producer in his scheme of existence. It may, however, be possible that the military mind has now vague glimmerings of the truth: that no nation can be totally independent of the commercial and industrial welfare of another. Even the commercial men of France begin to realize that conquerors are, more often than not, mere conquerors in name. But, here again we stumble upon the amazing indifference of men to the authority of experience. The commercial men of France, or any country, could have learned all this before hostilities began, had they taken the trouble to read what happened after the Franco-German war. After that peace, a peace of the military mind, it was not the conquered, but the con-

queror that received the industrial set-back. But that was a quarrel between two adjoining countries, not a world convulsion such as we have recently suffered, engulfing in misery the greater portion of the people of the universe. Who has escaped?

The Nationalists of Europe, led by the imperialists in their governments, have brought Europe to ruin. It is an ugly fact, but one we have to face sternly, courageously. And this being the case, it must be evident to those who read Mr. Keynes's book that the time is come for men of European mind to do the work of restitution, and attempt to realize the dreams of Europe's best friends. The first step in the work of restoration must be the repudiation of the covenant and the treaty, for these nightmares of imperialists cursed with old minds, can never endure in the waking day which must come to Europe, if her people are to rise again to still higher things than they ever achieved in the past in which, among inglorious periods they sometimes wrought the wonders and the triumphs of civilization. The Renaissance this time must indeed be a new birth, a birth coming from the dream of those who were Europe's patriots, and believed in a United States of Europe. Their names shine like beacons through the murk and strife of our day, and no one country, neither Germany nor Great Britain, can say it has had a preponderance of thinkers who believed firmly in the practicability of European peace, and the possibility of a unified Europe. Victor Hugo's dream of a United States of Europe was Goethe's dream; Saint Pierre's dream was Nietzsche's dream; and their dream was John Locke's and Tolstoi's and that of many another great European mind. Surely supporters of the old system, who today are straining every nerve to save it from utter collapse, cannot say that they have not had every opportunity their gods can give, to work out a system of civilization in Europe free from fear, ignorance, envy, and hatred. They have failed in every particular. History has no value to them, the experience of their own generation teaches them nothing; the gods they raise stand on the same old clay feet of the national gods of their fathers. All progress in science and art is made in spite of their systems, and whatever is good in international relationships is derived from trade and commerce which, by protective tariffs, they would check and diminish.

Mr. Keynes says:

> "* * * The future life of Europe was not their concern; its means of livelihood was not their anxiety. Their preoccupations, good and bad alike, related to frontiers and nationalities, to the balance of power, to imperial aggrandizements, to the future enfeeblement of a strong and dangerous enemy, to revenge, and to the shifting by the victors of their unbearable financial burdens on to the shoulders of the defeated."

It was enough for Mr. Keynes to see the peace treaty to force him to send in his resignation as the representative of the British Treasury; as an economist, as a scholar, who had to think out the problems of the state, he must have been appalled at the findings of the Allied statesmen. Let any business man, no matter what his prejudice has been during the war, read Mr. Keynes's chapter on *Reparation,* and then try to estimate in wages the worth of the three gentlemen who worked out reparation and indemnities on the basis of an annual payment which would amount to $2,400,000,000. Statesmen are usually highly paid officials, but the remuneration that would be paid to a scientist who could draw blood from a stone, or gold from a brick, would be beyond estimate. And yet the terms of the treaty were drawn up, as Mr. Keynes says:

> "In Paris, where those connected with the Supreme Economic Council received almost hourly the reports of the misery, disorder, and decaying organization of all Central and Eastern Europe, allied and enemy alike, and learnt from the lips of the financial representatives of Germany and Austria unanswerable evidence of the terrible exhaustion of their countries, an occasional visit to the hot, dry room in the President's house, where the Four fulfilled their destinies in empty and arid intrigue, only added to the sense of nightmare. * * *"

And now, months after Mr. Keynes wrote his book, we learn from Sir William Goode, Director of British Relief Missions, that Europe is on the brink of "utter demoralization and even anarchy." Sir William says:

> "Of one thing I am absolutely convinced, and that is that to continue to provide food without at the same time providing raw materials on which to re-establish industry is merely to aggravate the problem of Europe.
>
> "Another issue which may just as well be faced is that neither the Allies nor the new Allied States can reasonably expect American capital to be provided in the shape of credits for ex-enemy countries if the first fruits are to be taken out of these countries in the shape of repatriation."

This is a statement from an authority we are bound to consider in the gravest possible manner. If it means anything it means the treaty is defunct, and the covenant which was created for the purpose, not ostensibly, of exacting the terms of the treaty, and reserving to the members of the Grand Alliance the power of disposing of European people to suit their clients, is for all practical purposes dead also.

How men having sufficient political intelligence to win the suffrage of their electors could so fly in the face of stern facts, is one of the mysteries of statesmanship. But the President came home with the idea

that he had at any rate a covenant which contained the fourteen points. Having been a witness to a treaty which was made, when every one of his points was destroyed by Foch's military terms, after the conditions of the armistice were solemnly agreed to by all parties, it is not surprising that he should think that the covenant contained what he wanted. The chamber in which the fate of Europe was decided by the authors of the covenant and the treaty must, according to Mr. Keynes's description of it, have been something like a padded cell, where neither light nor sound could penetrate. Could they have drawn up that treaty if the information that Mr. Hoover gave to the world had reached their ears? Last summer he told us that "the unemployment bureaus in Europe showed that 15,000,000 of families were receiving unemployment allowances in one form or another," that there was "a great relaxation of effort as the reflex of physical exhaustion of large sections of the population from privation and the mental and physical strain of war."

It seems to us that the fear that drove us to war in 1914 is all that is left by the peace. Fear is the result of it all, and it smites in every direction. Where there were certain sections of some of the nations shaken by fear a few years ago, whole continents are now paralyzed by fear. Mr. Keynes sums this condition up in a statement of extraordinary power:

> "* * * The terror and personal timidity of the individuals of this class (great capitalists) is now so great, their confidence in their place in society and in their necessity to the social organism so diminished, that they are the easy victims of intimidation. * * * They allow themselves to be ruined and altogether undone by their own instruments, governments of their own making, and a press of which they are the proprietors. Perhaps it is historically true that no order of society ever perishes save by its own hand * * *"

And now what must be done to save Europe? Mr. Keynes has a program:

> "1. The Revision of the Treaty.
> 2. The settlement of inter-Ally indebtedness.
> 3. An international loan and the reform of the currency.
> 4. The relations of Central Europe to Russia."

He has, however, very little faith in the so-called League of Nations for dealing with the question of revision. He says we must "trust the new governments" which he looks for in the principal Allied countries "to show a profounder wisdom and a greater magnanimity than their predecessors." This is not particularly encouraging for those of us who are stirred by his admirably written, well-tempered, indictment of the ugly business accomplished in Paris. He does, nevertheless, make a suggestion of a positive nature when he advocates for Europe a Free Trade Union. There he hits the nail on the head, for tariffs strike at the very foundation of peace and good will among the people. A tariff means a frontier, a frontier means armies, seaboards mean navies, armies and navies and tariffs require diplomats, and so on and so on, until there is rebuilt the rotten structure of the old Europe. The question of inter-Ally indebtedness we hope to deal with in another article. We agree with him that "we shall never be able to move again, unless we can free our limbs from these paper shackles." An international loan "to which all members of the League of Nations would contribute according to their means" will not save, even if there were such a thing as a League of Nations, Europe from war in the future. The relations of Central Europe to Russia will depend entirely upon what is done to replace the treaty and the covenant of the Grand Alliance.

"The Economic Consequences of the Peace" is a work that should go into every home in the United States, there to be read and studied without prejudice, for we know of nothing else in the literature of the war that states the case of the peace with so much candor and clarity. It is written by a great scholar, a fine type of English gentleman, whose mind is broad enough to reject extraneous questions for those which concern a European settlement of all the questions which have brought about conditions dominated by fear. The hope of Europe will not be found in a reconstruction of the old systems tottering to their fall, but in the new birth of a system which will give to Europe some of the cohesion of a frontierless territory such as we enjoy in the United States of America.

FRANCIS NEILSON.

THE GARDEN.

And now it is all to be done over again
  And what will come of it only God can know.
What has become of the furrows ploughed by pain
  And the hopes set row on row?

Where are the lines of beautiful bending trees?
  The gracious springs, the depths of delicate shade?
The sunny spaces loud with the humming of bees,
  And the grassy paths in the garden my life had made?

Lightning and earthquake now have blasted and riven,
  Even the trees that I trusted could not stand;
Now it lies here to the bitter winds of Heaven
  A barren and a desolated land.

The Bookman. —*Aline Kilmer.*

SILENCE.

Oh for one of the stars to know me,
To say, "That is she," as I say, "It is there."
Oh for my hills to show me
  If they care.
But when I speak of them nothing hears me.
Even the bird on the near bough fears me.
The fire on my hearth does not know that it cheers me
* * * Heart that waits by the fire, do you guess
What you must voice in your tenderness?

—*Zona Gale.*

Harper's Magazine.

THE PULPIT

Shall America Lose Her Soul?

By
John Herman Randall, Associate Minister of the Community Church New York

There is only one real danger confronting America today. Among the myriad fears that have been conjured up to dog our every footstep and that fill the mind with apprehension as we face the unknown future, there is only one fear that is fraught with actual menace for this country. It is the greatest danger that can ever threaten any people because it is the most subtle and insidious in its approach. It is the danger that America may forget the fundamental spiritual values for which she has professed to stand in the past,—those great values that constitute her real soul and that have given her the place of high distinction she has held thus far among the nations of the earth.

If America can keep her soul alive and alert amid these troublous times, it is safe to say that there is no problem, however complex, that she will not be able to solve, no obstacle, however great, that she will not surmount, no difficulty, however baffling, that she cannot overcome. The many seemingly insoluble problems confronting her just now will become surcharged with menace *only* if she loses her consciousness of the true genius that has guided her highest destinies, only when she forgets the soul from which her noblest spirit and loftiest ideals have sprung.

That this is not, like so many others, an imaginary danger, becomes self-evident when we reflect upon the un-American things that are taking place and that are not only tolerated but even applauded by many so-called American people. It is not necessary in this connection to refer specifically to such happenings; the daily papers are full of them. Even more convincing of the real danger that threatens America's soul, is the un-American character of the sentiments that are finding expression constantly in the columns of the press, on lecture platform and even from the pulpits of many churches. It is food for thought that an increasing number of serious people are beginning to doubt honestly whether America has any soul or not, and the most alarming factor in the situation lies in the fact that there are evidently multitudes in this country, in spite of all our patriotic organizations, who are utterly ignorant of the true nature of the soul of America. For these reasons, it is plain that there is no more important question to be asked today than the one: What really constitutes the true soul of America? And surely nothing is more greatly needed today than the explicit answer to that question. Let us attempt a brief analysis of what, in our judgment, does constitute the true soul of America.

(1) There can be no doubt that at the very foundation of the life of this people, woven into the warp and woof of the real American spirit, lies *a new respect for the individual, simply as such.* No other nation has ever professed such a conception of the individual's worth in himself. Among other peoples, the individual has been valued for the sake of his inheritance of blood or property, or because of what he has been able to achieve in his personal life, or for his ability to rise above others in the struggle for existence, or for his possession of what we deem the masterful qualities of life. But here in America we have professed to appraise personality not by what appears on the surface but by what we believe to be latent in all men, not by the apparent but by the unapparent, not by what a man has actually realized in himself but by his spiritual possibilities. It is not blood, or social position, or special endowments, or even unusual achievements that determine our attitude toward men, but what we see to be potential in all men. This is why the essential tendency of our thought has been to value the individual simply in his quality as a human being. America's ideal has been that of the uncommon quality latent in the common man and woman, however imperfectly we may have realized that ideal in actual practice.

It is self-evident that this is an ethical and spiritual ideal; on any other basis it would be absurd. Men are not born free and equal in their physical inheritance, their mental endowments, their moral power or their spiritual discernment. Taking men as they are, they are assuredly not equal. The differences between them, on the contrary, are clearly evident and often glaring. "The common man is not uncommonly fine spiritually, but viewed from the outside, he often appears 'uncommonly' common." When we predicate equality of all men, we are affirming what does not yet exist save in our profound faith in the possibilities of all men. And as our attitude toward men is governed by this faith, we dare to believe that we shall best help them to realize their, as yet, latent and undeveloped possibilities. It is clear that this is a purely ethical ideal, based not upon what we see but upon what we believe exists potentially in every man. Until this nation was born, no people had ever risen to the spiritual height where it had either the faith or the courage to assume frankly this ethical attitude toward the individual life.

But whence came this lofty ideal of human nature? Where did America discover this "new" respect for man, just as man? The answer to this question leads us back through nineteen centuries of human history to the Man of Nazareth and his profound conviction of the supreme worth of the individual life. In the world to which Jesus came, the individual was lost in the mass and counted for nothing, as such. The ruling class, the priests and the soldiers, were either respected or else feared. They were the only people worthy of consideration; the rest counted for nothing. The mass of men were to the Jews only "hewers of wood and drawers of water," to the Greeks only "hoi polloi," to the Romans only "plebeians" and slaves. There was absolutely no sense of the spiritual unity or solidarity or oneness underlying humanity. All mankind was broken up into isolated fragments; there was no bond of sympathy that could stretch across the yawning chasms which divided race from race, nation from nation, class from class and man from man. There was no sense of kinship even; every possible distinction was emphasized to the utmost and all likenesses were either minimized or forgotten. There were the countless racial distinctions;

the Romans had only one word for foreigner and enemy. All the world was divided into two portions, *cives et hostes*; either citizens of Rome or enemies of Rome. There were all the various distinctions of culture. The philosophic, literary and artistic Greeks boasted, and rightfully, of their "culture"; but they lumped all other peoples together under the one indiscriminate and contemptuous title of "barbarians." There were the endless religious distinctions and prejudices. The Hebrews recognized only two divisions of humanity, the chosen people of the Lord,—those who were "the children of Abraham" and, therefore, of Jehovah, on the one side, and the "dogs of Gentiles" on the other. There were the old distinctions of sex. In almost all the nations woman was regarded as being hardly human. She was simply a thing, owned and possessed by her lord and master, as his slave or his toy or his drudge or as the instrument for the gratifying of his lust. There were all the distinctions of employment and function in society. The working men of Greese and Rome were nearly all slaves. As such they were no more human than the horse or any beast of burden. They were simply the tools of production; they were things—to handle and use. The workers in the fields, the mines or at the bench were simply the "unclean masses" to whom even pity was denied. Even a Plato and an Aristotle, the greatest minds of antiquity, acquiesced in the common view which regarded the workingman, the toiler anywhere, as practically outside the boundaries of a common humanity and, therefore, as having no human rights.

Into such a stratified and divided world came the revolutionary message of Jesus, sweeping away all these artificial distinctions of race and nation, of culture and creed, of sex and employment, and proclaiming a common humanity and a universal brotherhood of man based upon the sacredness and infinite worth of every man, woman and child, simply as human beings. He saw all men as the children of the Universal Father, and he discerned in every individual, even the lowest and the least, something of the Divine, which it was his great mission to foster and develop to the full. This profound message of Jesus fell, for the most part, on barren soil and deaf ears. It has never yet been accepted in its fullness with all its wondrous implications. Really to believe this one truth and live it out in all the relations of life would mean the transformation of the world. But the world was not ready to conceive the truth then, and it is not ready yet.

It is the chief glory of America that, first among all the peoples of earth, she dared to found her life, in theory at least, on the moral and spiritual possibilities of men and women, simply as human beings. In this great faith she discovered her soul and took her place as the most progressive nation in all that makes for human advancement. The Bill of Rights, embodied in our Constitution, all that we have frankly granted men—freedom of speech, freedom of the press, the right of free assembly, freedom in all matters of conscience and religion, the right of trial by jury and all the other privileges of American democracy grow out of this fundamental respect for the individual as such. I said, "in theory at least," for we must all confess that we have come far short of translating this great faith in human beings into our actual life, either individually or collectively. And today it is not strange if conscientious objectors and political prisoners and peaceful strikers and Russian deportees are inclined to question just what our professed faith in the sacredness of the individual life really means. It is a new and strange America that is revealing itself today to many of us, an America that we do not recognize, an America that we did not believe existed. In the light of American principles and ideals, in the presence of the spirit and the words of our greatest leaders in the past, does it not seem as if America, for the time being at least, has forgotten her soul, or allowed it to become eclipsed by the hysteria of the hour? Shall America lose her soul? She never can until she ceases to reverence and regard as sacred every man, woman and child within her borders.

(2) Along with this great faith in the individual there entered into the soul of America another profound conviction. It was the belief *that it was possible to build on these shores a true democracy,* springing out of an actual freedom of individuals and consisting of a union of free men and women, in the spirit of co-operation, for the sake of the highest good of all. The ideal of democracy that found expression in the words "a Government of the people, for the people and by the people," has been a constantly growing and expanding ideal as we ourselves have grown and developed. It is a much bigger and broader thing today than it was in the time of our fathers; and in our modern thinking, we are extending the ideal to include all of life. We realize now that we shall never have the true democracy until all of society is democratized from center to circumference. The unrest of today is the inevitable result of the increasing demand for *a real democracy* that is co-extensive with all of life.

After we had gained our independence in 1776, the realization of our ideal of democracy seemed a comparatively simple thing. When we started, our population numbered four or five millions. Now there are one hundred and ten millions, and other millions coming. In the beginning we were practically a homogeneous people, now there are twenty-three languages spoken in a single school. For years the emigrants who came to these shores were chiefly those who had grown up in northern Europe and who were more or less familiar with our institutions, so that they were easily assimilated. For the last generation there has been a steadily increasing stream of emigrants from southern and eastern Europe and also from the Orient, who do not understand our institutions and know nothing about our ideals. With this vast multitude, and this heterogeneous population, we are attempting the most difficult experiment that has ever been tried in the world—seeking to invest with sovereignty the common man, just because we profess to believe in the latent possibilities he possesses.

But in splendid faith America has confronted these difficulties and still clung to her ideal. In her soul, she has professed to see in these increasing difficulties only new and greater opportunities for achievement. She has declared again and again that this is the Land of Promise, not only as a haven for the disadvantaged of other lands, a country where the oppressed might come to repair their fortunes and breathe the air of freedom, but also the Land of Promise for the native population, in the sense that

they might continually be penetrated by what is best in the newcomers, ever catching wider visions and gaining deeper insights, and thus be kept from growing old and rigid and effete. And she has believed that in time all these newcomers, from whatever land, might become essential and vital parts of our common life.

There is no denying the many comparative failures of our democracy thus far, but the thing needed is not less but more of democracy, if we are to attain the goal. We realize today that our failures have been due primarily to a misconception of what freedom really means. There have been many who have said: "Men are free to work for as long hours as they please, or for as low wages as they please. They must be left absolutely free to make their own individual arrangements with their employers." And others have said: "We who employ labor must be left free to exploit men and women and even little children as we please; we must have the right to get from the sweat of the toiler all the profit we please." In a word, the practically prevailing notion of freedom has been that it left one free to do as he pleases, regardless of others. But such a selfish conception of freedom has no place whatever in a true Democracy. The freedom of democracy consists, not in doing what one pleases, but rather, in the freedom to *unite together,* to work together, to live together in the spirit of co-operation, for the sake of the largest growth and highest development of all. This is what we mean by the "new democracy" of today. It is "new" only in the sense that we are penetrating deeper to the real soul of America in its great ideals of a genuine democracy, and discovering more clearly just what the principles of democracy imply and all the depths of meaning that they involve. If the individual is of sufficient worth to be given political freedom, he is of sufficient value to have industrial and social and religious freedom, as it has never yet been accorded to him in these realms.

Shall America lose her soul? Never, unless we forget that our freedom is not a license to do as we please, but only and always, a freedom to unite with all others for the sake of the highest good of all.

(3) But in the soul of America there has always been *a certain receptivity of spirit, an openness of mind, a willingness to learn from all others and to take the best that others have to offer.* There are many who seem to believe that all our ideals and institutions were originated *de novo* here on this new continent; but history tells a very different story. What America did was to take the best that older peoples and other nations had evolved; and then she welded these various elements into something new, something different, something greater than had ever had existence before. Our Puritan Fathers brought to these shores from England the fundamental idea of self-government, for which we can never be too grateful; but in spite of that, they were rather a bigoted and intolerant group after all. In Massachusetts' Bay Colony, no one had the right to vote unless he had been baptized in infancy into the Congregational Church. It was these same Puritans who hanged four Quakers on Boston Common, who fined and imprisoned and deported the Baptists, who drove Roger Williams into the wilderness where he spent the winter with the more friendly Indians, and who deported the Church of England men of Wollaston simply because they were Anglicans. The principle of religious toleration was not learned from the Puritans. It was won only through the loyalty and heroism and sufferings of the Quakers and Baptists and other so-called heretics. It was from Holland that we learned the great lesson of civil and political toleration, through the Dutch who came to these shores, so that at length we too could boast with little Holland across the sea that our country was the asylum and the home for all the oppressed and downtrodden of other lands. When Thomas Jefferson and Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Paine visited France, after she had passed through the tragic throes of her revolution, they brought back to this country those great ideas of equality and fraternity to enrich and broaden our growing ideals of liberty. In more recent times we, with all other progressive peoples, have taken lessons from Germany in welfare legislation,—old age pensions, minimum wage, etc., and we are learning similar lessons today from the British Australias. Even tiny Switzerland has given us the principles of the initiative and the referendum.

Every successive wave of immigration has brought its own peculiar contribution to our thought and ideals and has tended to enrich our common life. Let one illustration suffice. From England we borrowed the Christmas dinner with its steaming plum pudding; from Germany, the Christmas tree with its candles and tinsel; and from Holland the kindly figure of the old man, Santa Claus, who makes everybody happy with his presents. Out of all these borrowed elements we have fashioned for ourselves a Christmas that is new, unique and different from that of any other land.

It is thus that the soul of America has been formed. It was not born full-fledged; it grew as all souls grow. And it grew strong and noble through the selection, the correlation, the assimilation into something better and finer, as we believe, of all these various elements, principles and ideals which have most appealed to us in the life of other peoples. With the awakening of a new life and aspiration among all peoples, Orient as well as Occident, surely there is much yet for us to learn. Shall America lose her soul today? Not unless she loses all humility, and becomes so proudly self-complacent and self-sufficient as to be blinded to the good and true and beautiful, from whatever source it may come.

(4) But a still more characteristic element in the soul of America has been *her sense of freedom to grow, to change, to develop.* From the earliest beginnings of this country there has been a genuine plasticity in our thought and our life, as opposed to the fixed status and unprogressive rigidity of the old world. As a people, we are forward-looking; we live in the expectant mood continually. Every other nation has some brand of culture, some particular form of civilization, handed down from the past, of which it is the special custodian and which it seeks to further develop.

America has no such single tradition. "We are dedicated not to the preservation of what has been, but to the creation of what never has been. America, in a peculiar sense, is the prophet of the future, not the priest of the past." We are always eagerly wondering what will take place next. Will another Emerson come along? Will another Whitman appear? Will another Lincoln arise? No one can say. All we do know is that the greatest experiences of our past already tend to fade in memory, not because

we do not reverence that past, but because nothing that the past has achieved, however great, can satisfy us today, because we are forever looking forward to greater accomplishments, we are forever seeking a truth that is beyond any truth ever yet spoken.

The great synonym for America is "enterprise." We have subdued the wilderness and tunneled the mountains and belted the continent from coast to coast. We build our sky-scrapers today only to tear them down and build greater tomorrow. There is no project that discourages our will or baffles our skill. We say, we are equal to anything. But this is only half the story and the lower half at that. The spirit of heroic enterprise, so characteristic of America, is not limited to the material realm or confined to physical achievements. It is just as actual in the realm of moral endeavor and spiritual adventure, only we fail to apply it there with the same energy that we express in the field of material things.

The soul of America is a living and, therefore, a constantly growing thing. The Mayflower did not bring to these shores the finished product. Freedom is a thing that must be re-won over and over again, or else it is lost. Our fathers fought bravely in 1776 for freedom and they gained it then. Washington and Jefferson and others of the early leaders realized at the time that the institution of human slavery was a dangerous menace, but they trusted that in some way time would abolish it. But as the years went on, the old institution only wove its coils more tightly about this nation, binding politicians and businessmen, judges and lawyers and even ministers in its subtle grasp, until it threatened to choke the very life out of the nation. And then, men came to see that Bunker Hill and Valley Forge would not suffice, but that the old struggle for freedom must be waged again if this country was to be really free. It is the same old task that we are confronting once again today, with all the reactionary forces arrayed against us, and upon our unswerving loyalty *now* to the soul of America depends the maintainance of our ideals and our free institutions. For freedom is an achievement, not a bequest; it must be won and re-won again and again, if it is to be preserved. Under different forms, it is the same old struggle that each generation must face afresh. And only those who face the struggle with dauntless spirit and tireless energy are in any sense deserving of freedom.

What has been achieved in the realm of the material, we *know* can find its counterpart in the moral and spiritual progress of the life of the people. Shall America lose her soul? Never, until that soul ceases to be a pioneering soul, ever venturing forth on new quests of truth, on new conquests of freedom in the advancing life of man.

(5) But there is one other element that characterizes the soul of America—the spirit of large generosity, of kindliness, of magnanimity toward all. When, at the time of the Boxer uprising in China, through the influence of John Hay, then Secretary of State, this country returned the entire amount of the indemnity to China, not only our own people but all the world applauded the action as being most characteristic of the spirit of America. It is inconceivable that America should ever consent to the disposition of the Shantung Province as arranged by the Peace of Versailles unless that spirit has absolutely departed from our life.

In John Drinkwater's play, "Abraham Lincoln," now running in New York, the English dramatist, with keen insight, has grasped the essential spirit of the great American. As scene follows scene, it is the greatness of heart, the kindliness of soul, the magnanimity of spirit that dwelt in Lincoln that stand forth supreme. In this temper, he represented a spiritual development far beyond that of any of his contemporaries, a development that centuries hence will still be in advance of the world of men. And yet, as the years have passed, we have come to regard him not only as the great, but as the ideal American. Can any one doubt but that he voiced the deepest soul of America in those matchless words: "With malice toward none, with charity for all"? Shall America lose her soul today? Not unless she is willing to forget the spirit that dwelt so richly in Abraham Lincoln.

As we recall these fundamental characteristics of the soul of America, familiar to every student of American history,—the new respect for the individual as such, the aspiration toward a true democracy, the spirit of receptivity toward truth and ideals regardless of the source from whence they may come, the freedom to grow and change in harmony with constantly expanding ideals and the spirit of magnanimity and generous kindliness toward all—and then, as we look about us in society today, as we read our papers and listen to the sentiments so often expressed from pulpit or platform, is it strange that there are so many who feel that America has forgotten her soul in the present crisis, that she has turned her back on first principles and is following after strange gods, that she has lost the wondrous vision of her great leaders and, therefore, is no longer loyal to her true ideals? It is this that troubles so many who love and believe in the America of our ideals.

But where lies the responsibility for the dimming of America's soul today? On whom rests the blame that, for so many, the spiritual values for which America has stood in the past, however imperfectly, have apparently been forgotten? How is it possible that so many un-American things should have taken place in our midst, and that the majority should have tolerated them, even if they have not always approved? There is no question but that the War created an abnormal atmosphere in which bitterness and prejudice and hatred have run rife, blinding men's eyes to the truth and making men's hearts callous to the common humanities. But should not these abnormal conditions, occasioned by war, have served only to awaken the soul of America to a keener sense of its responsibility in such a crisis? Why should they have deadened, rather than have aroused the soul of this nation?

The fundamental blame does not rest upon the War. It goes farther back than that and comes closer home to each one of us personally. Neither does the responsibility rest wholly upon the Lusk Committee, nor on Speaker Sweet, nor on those who "Jailed the 800 radicals" recently in Detroit, nor on the officials who brought about the wholesale deportation of "dangerous aliens," without granting them the right of trial by jury, nor on Secretary Burleson, nor on Attorney General Palmer. These officials are not responsible for America's losing her soul. They may be the immediate, but they are not the primary cause of the un-American spirit so prevalent today. As a matter of fact they are only the natural and inevitable result of the loss of America's soul that had already taken place. They are possible only because the rest

of us have forgotten that America has a soul. They are the final product of our own blindness and supineness and indifference to those spiritual values that alone make us great as a people.

Let us be honest with ourselves. It is we, the respectable, patriotic Americans, we, who proudly trace our ancestry back to the Mayflower or the Pilgrim Fathers, we who have proved our eligibility to belong to the Sons of the American Revolution or the Daughters of the Revolution or any of the other patriotic societies, we who gather every year around the banqueting tables and applaud the sentiments of patriotism and the ideals of Americanism without ever taking the trouble to find out what the ideals of true Americanism really are,—it is we who in the last analysis are responsible for the dimming of America's soul, it is upon us that the real blame must finally rest.

And if America should ever permanently lose her soul,—which, God forbid!—it will only be because we, the respectable good-citizens of America, are too ignorant or too absorbed in our selfish pursuits to know that America has a soul, or else, too indolent or prejudiced to make the honest effort to discover wherein lies the true greatness of that soul.

CORRESPONDENCE

Selected Readings for the Pulpit

Dear UNITY:

I have received from one of our ministers a proposal that a book of non-biblical selections from great writers, ancient and modern, be prepared for the use of clergymen in their pulpit ministrations, a lectionary which shall take the place of, or supplement the Scripture readings in public worship—much as passages from Mrs. Eddy's writings are read side by side with extracts from the Bible in Christian Science Temples.

There is merit in the plan suggested, but I confess that my observation and experience make me more than doubtful of the value of these ready-made helps to ministers of which a number have already been produced. The joy and benefit of such compilations arise largely from our own discovery and original use of them as the fruits of our personal study and meditation; not their casual recital from a book.

It is so with the Sunday lesson from the Scriptures. The compilation of Bible passages by Rev. U. G. B. Pierce is an excellent piece of work. I have it lying on my desk and often refer to and read it. But it has contributed, I fear, to make our ministers indifferent to the Bible itself and neglectful in its use. We are raising up a generation of lazy ministers who, when Sunday morning arrives, hurriedly catch up this or some other anthology and make rapid choice of selections, while their original source, the volume which has had so large an influence in shaping our religion and our civilization, lies unopened on the pulpit. It is even disappearing altogether from some of our churches. In one church in which I preached not long ago I found a popular anthology of Scripture Readings on the pulpit, but no Bible. Careful and prompt investigation discovered it in a pile of miscellaneous articles in an adjoining room, which were to be disposed of at a rummage sale the next day. But for our intervention this particular volume, from which eight ministers in succession had read their Sunday lessons, and from which Robert Collyer, Edward Everett Hale, Julia Ward Howe, Jenkin Lloyd Jones, and other of our saintly ministers had chosen the text of their discourse, would have been sold as superfluous rubbish to the highest bidder!

As for non-biblical lectionaries—I have used them in the pulpit more or less for fifty years—*less* the longer and riper my experience with congregations. I note that the latter listen with mild interest to the minister's usually rapid and poor reading of disconnected, fragmentary passages from Buddha, Zoroaster, Joaquin Miller, Erasmus, Andrew Jackson, Davis, Huxley, Mrs. Besant, Milton, Marduk, Ella Wheeler Wilcox, Aeschylus, Amy Lowell, Tennyson, Cardinal Newman, Bernard Shaw, etc. These scrappy, half-intelligible sentences usually leave no definite impression on their minds. Moreover, while they may impart some intellectual stimulus to those who listen, they do not arouse or deepen the spirit of worship in them, which it is the aim of the opening services of Sunday morning to produce through hymn and prayer and Scripture reading.

But when the minister turns to the Bible word, known, endeared to, and revered since childhood by his congregation, the source of so much of their religious feeling and expression, how devoutly they listen! How they follow and take to heart its teachings, parables, poems and histories, expressed to them in their own spiritual vernacular! I should hesitate to utter this opinion so confidently if it were not that nearly all ministers (except a few young men who are experimenting) with whom I have conferred on this topic have agreed with me.

The reading of non-biblical scriptures, ancient and modern, may still be employed as a means of grace in the pulpit, if it were only to vindicate the breadth and inclusiveness of our religious sympathy, and to illustrate our belief in the universality of religious inspiration. But to neglect the Bible in our devotions, or to deal it out in scrappy selections made by another, is, in my judgment, a serious mistake, and a bad example to the congregations whom we are called to instruct and to serve.

CHARLES W. WENDTE.

THE DISH-WASHER.

Above the foam curled a light plume of steam—
An airy blue embodiment of dream,
That drew the tribute of her eager gaze
As though it were a genie from a vase.

Her hands worked on with even rise and fall,
But she was not aware of them at all.
A breeze came in, a stranger to the town,
And set her tumblers bobbing up and down,
And making tinkling music, frail and sweet,
Like fairy bells you startle with your feet
In woodland grass. Then happily her soul
Awoke to sunlight nesting in a bowl:
A little crystal boat it seemed to be
Upon the life and lustre of the sea.

Poetry. —*Amanda Hall.*

CONTRIBUTED

Anent the Suppression of Radicalism

From a Foreign-born Citizen's Viewpoint

The warfare against radicalism has taken on such dimensions as to challenge the attention of every thinking person. What is this so much talked about radicalism? Having read almost all our newspapers have had to say about it, I, for one, have to confess that I do not know. It seems, however, to resemble a manyheaded monster or a hydra, if we believe our press-reports, that threatens to overthrow our government. Each head of this formidable monster is a different head from each of the other heads and speaks a different language. In fact, the elements that constitute radicalism differ as widely from one another as each one of them differs from the views held by the representatives of the government that tries so hard to exterminate them. It has become the habit to style anyone who disagrees with our government a radical and to treat him as a dangerous and undesirable person who should either be imprisoned or deported. Consequently incarcerations and deportations have become the order of the day. The stand taken by those who follow this policy seems to be that our government is absolutely perfect, that any criticism of the same is wholly unwarranted, and rooted in ignorance and misunderstandings. To criticize or to disagree with our once-for-all established government is nothing short of sacrilege or *lese majeste*. According to this view it is just as criminal to criticize our government as it once was to criticize the Bible.

Now, as a matter of fact, no human government is perfect, nor ever can be. A nation who believes that it has reached the acme of perfection so far as its government is concerned will soon find itself stuck in the quagmire of stagnation, and political progress will cease. Every nation on earth, with the exception of ours, acknowledges this fact, and is constantly endeavoring to improve its government. The elements of a body politic who strive for and advocate such improvements are, in all constitutionally governed countries, organized as separate parties who in perfect freedom advocate their views and form legally recognized factions of legislatures and parliaments or whatever their respective representative bodies might be called. They simply belong to the "opposition," the "left wing" of the political machinery, and they are satisfied with their standing no matter if they become victors or vanquished in a political contest in which all have an equal chance. Their presence is looked upon rather as a wholesome counterbalance against the ruling majority than a danger and a menace, rather a help to progress than a hindrance.

We Americans are the only nation who refuses to recognize these elements of opposition. We are afraid of them and look upon them as a menace to our government and to our institutions. We consequently treat them as criminals. Hundreds of them are now being deported and thousands are in jail under sentences of up to twenty years.

Can any sensible person believe that these drastic measures will eventually eradicate radicalism? Does not experience tend to show that just the opposite is what happens? Has not persecution always been the fertilizer of the soil on which opposition grows?

And is there not after all another and a more safe and effective way out of the chaotic political and social conditions that prevail in our midst? Why not try the same method as other and older nations have found so helpful, and which has enabled the Roman Catholic Church to survive the wear and tear of the ages? Why not leave the radical minority alone and let them help to work out the salvation of our society, as they see it, and as recognized or at least tolerated political organizations side by side with the rest of us? Would not this method be a better and more just and rational way of dealing with the problem of radicalism than the rigorous suppression now in practice?

AXEL LUNDEBERG.

Without An Enemy

When a physician is called upon to set a broken leg he does not first stop and inquire into the injured man's character. He does not ask if he is a friend. But he immediately responds to the sufferer's need.

Are we not all, in truth, physicians to one another? Whenever we meet a fellow man who is in need of service is not our first duty to render that service? He may not need material service. It may be that kindliness, sympathy or understanding is the service required of us.

If a man's vision is narrow our business as physicians of the soul is to widen the vision, not berate him. If his heart is hardened, is it not our business to see that it is softened so that the sorrow and anguish of humanity may make an impression upon it? How can we do this if we first stop to condemn and then to visit our scorn on the one whom we know to be more in need of a physician than of a judge and executioner?

A wise stoic said, "A physician is not angry at the intemperance of a mad patient, neither does he take it ill to be railed at by one in a fever. Just so should a wise man treat all mankind as a physician does a patient and look upon them as sick or extravagant."

The business man has learned to be friendly with his customers. He restrains himself when he is serving those whom he thinks he dislikes. But his contact with these customers often leads to understanding and then to friendship.

This friendly attitude toward men is a condition of our understanding them. Enmity blinds the eyes; good-will opens them. So long as the unfriendly feeling is maintained we not only shut ourselves off from knowledge of men but also from many happy friendships. Many a man has found even his enmity disappearing in the warmth of an intimate acquaintance.

When we permit intellectual differences to grow into personal dislike we are raising barriers that prevent our being of service to one another. Antagonisms and hates lead nowhere and render no service. They are a part of the useless burden under which mankind staggers up the hill. How can we respect ourselves if we add even a feather's weight to this awful load.

The world needs the healing words of love and good will today. Being "without an enemy" we can enter into the life of all, we can serve all and love all.

ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY.

THE FIELD

The World is my country, to do good is my Religion"

WHY NOT HAVE UNIVERSAL COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING?

A letter from the Rev. Chas. F. Dole to Editor of the *Advertiser*—There is no more momentous question than this before the American people. Do they not care to think, before it is settled for them by a small interested party? Looked at from a single point of view, the scheme looks plausible. If democracy is merely a piece of political machinery, if we live in a world where might and money are the chief values and where civilization is evidenced by census figures; if it is tolerable to be split apart from each other by fear and suspicion into quarreling classes and races and nations, we shall doubtless drift into the same blind dependence upon vast military force, upon which all big and rich governments have rested. For the governmental people, who make the wars, always tell us, as the Prussians did, that they only seek to secure us from the aggressions of our neighbors.

But democracy is not a piece of machinery, and civilization does not depend upon the improvement of airplanes, and human security does not rest upon lyddite and poison gases. Democracy implies humane respect for everyone and for men of all races; it abhors violence; it lives and labors in the hope of richer forms of social welfare and happiness. A quite new point of view now appears from which the whole militaristic system of crude, destructive violence is seen, with its paint and glamor and smooth excuses stripped off, to be preposterous and inhuman.

In the first place no worse training for young minds can exist than to fill them with the pride of power and bigness. Why are they made soldiers, except to be ready to kill their neighbors? This is indeed miseducation.

Moreover, the idea of a vast citizen army rests upon inconsiderate fears and suspicions. Why, for instance, does Admiral Sims want a fleet mightier than that of any other power? What dreadful enemy is he thinking about? Is it Great Britain? Is it Japan? Sink every battleship, dismantle every fort; stop your ugly thoughts; be ready to treat all the nations as we like to be treated, and no sensible man would ever lose a wink of sleep for fear of any nation on earth. Indeed, it is the feeling of the "big stick" in one's hands that makes men both cowards and bullies. No man or nation travels up the road to civilization with the big stick for companion.

Now, you cannot put deadly implements into boys' hands, you cannot familiarize them with the terms of battle, you cannot poison their consciences with war casuistry, you cannot apologize for lying and destruction, you cannot teach the bayonet thrust and the "art of war" to the brightest leaders of each new generation without reversing every costly and humanizing process which goes to make civilization. In other words democracy and civilization, to say nothing of Christianity, are diametrically incompatible with war.

I come to my last point. There will be young men in growing numbers who will surely see life from this new point of view. Do we not wish this? Already men are coming back from the great war quite disillusioned. We see letters from such men voicing their sense of the incomprehensible fatuity of the horrible business which they have witnessed. There will soon be, not a few thousand conscientious objectors, as in the late war, but ten times as many, and these, too, from the noblest American homes. What will you do with them? The story of the treatment of this class by our government is ugly reading for those who hold the traditions of American liberty. Will you persecute men, as true-hearted as any martyrs of the old times? History tells what happens in every attempt of a tyrannical government to force men's will. A democratic government cannot endure which persecutes men for conscience sake.

The fact is, there is a sharp issue between the spirit of militarism—a natural tyranny in all its forms—and the spirit of a free, progressive and democratic commonwealth. In this fact rests the defeat of the colossal scheme of military training now threatening the people of the United States. If we let it be tried, we shall find much shame, besides immense and extravagant cost. Meantime, we shall have inflicted untold spiritual hurt upon innumerable young men.

I assume, as do the sponsors of the scheme, that except for the feature of compulsory conscription they could never succeed. A purely voluntary military system, in the future as in the past, will never excite young Americans to flock to the standards. The normal tendency of modern times is away from militarism. Its routine and drill are stupid business; and the young men see no reason for living in fear of any people, provided we induce our government to conduct itself with justice and decency. The less armed power we put into its hands, the easier it will be to do this. —*Charles F. Dole.*

Honolulu, February 22, 1920.

It's a "Case" of Necessity

Your Printing will be above criticism if done by

THE OAKLAND PRESS

728 E. 39th Street
Phone Douglas 244

. . . . . "who would be abreast of thought"

SHOULD READ

The Christian Register

16 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass.

A Weekly Journal of Constructive and Progressive Religion

Subscription $3 Club Rates
SEND FOR FREE COPY

1,400 JOBS TO CHOOSE FROM

Young or old, man or woman, boy or girl, here is a descriptive story of 1,400 live occupations you may work at in the U. S., with instructions in sensible self-analysis which will show you how to pick out that for which you are physically and temperamentally best fitted. To get the right start in life, buy a copy of the new book,

How to Choose the Right Vocation

By HOLMES W. MERTON, Vocational Counselor

It will show you how to weigh and judge yourself and your possibilities and how to select the occupation in which your talents will bring you the greatest amount of success and profit. You will also learn from it how to judge and instruct others, how to select employees, etc. $1.50 net; by mail $1.62. *Send for it to-day!*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago

Schumann & Company

Cleaners of

FANCY GOWNS AND KID GLOVES

Having winter garments cleaned before storing them will keep out moth

PHONE DREXEL 231
ALL DEPARTMENTS

MAIN OFFICE AND WORKS
3954 Cottage Grove Avenue

Advance Roofing and Sheet Metal Works
INCORPORATED

FRANK R. PRIEVE, Pres.
4830-32 Cottage Grove Ave.
Phone Oakland 374

Sky-Lights and Sheet Metal Works. Gravel, Slate and Metal Roofing

Women's International League for Peace and Freedom

SECTION FOR THE UNITED STATES

(Formerly Woman's Peace Party)

OBJECT:

To organize support for the resolutions passed at the Women's International Congress at the Hague in 1915 and in Zurich in 1919, and to support movements to further Peace, Internationalism and the Freedom of Women.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:

Miss Jane Addams, President, U. S. A.
Miss Emily G. Balch, Secretary-Treasurer, U. S. A.
Mme. Gabrielle Duchene, France
Mlle. Marguerite Gobat, Switzerland
Frau Yella Hertzka, Austria
Frl. Lida Gustava Heymann, Germany
Frk. Martha Larsen, Norway
Miss Chrystal Macmillan, Great Britain
Mme. C. Ramondt-Hirschmann, Holland
Mrs. H. M. Swanwick, Great Britain

CONSULTATIVE MEMBERS, Executive Committee, Section for U. S. A.:

Miss Grace Abbott, Illinois
Miss Lillian D. Wald, New York
International Office, 19, Bd. Georges-Favon, Gevena, Switzerland

NATIONAL SECTIONS:

Australia	France	Netherlands
Austria	Germany	New Zealand
Belgium	Great Britain	Norway
Bulgaria	Hungary	Poland
Canada	India (British)	Sweden
Denmark	Ireland	Switzerland
Finland	Italy	United States

GENERAL OBJECTS:

To promote methods for the attainment of that peace between nations which is based on justice and good-will and to co-operate with women from other countries who are working for the same ends.

SPECIAL OBJECTS:

Those indicated by the Standing Committees and for immediate action to oppose universal compulsory military training; to oppose all invasions of Constitutional rights, free speech, free press and assembly and minority representation in legislative bodies; to oppose invasion of Mexico for purposes of war; to work to amend the League of Nations Covenant if it is ratified by the United States and if not so ratified, to secure a true Concert of Nations to substitute Law for War.

OFFICERS:

Chairman
Mrs. Anna Garlin Spencer, White Plains, N. Y.

Honorary Chairman
Miss Jane Addams, Chicago, Ill.

Secretary
Mrs. Lucy Biddle Lewis, Lansdowne, Pa.

Treasurer
Mrs. Hannah Clothier Hull, Swarthmore, Pa.

Vice-Chairmen
Miss S. P. Breckinridge, Ill.
Mrs. C. E. Cumberson, Calif.
Miss Zona Gale, Wis.
Mrs. Harriet P. Thomas, Fla.
Miss Jeannette Rankin, Mont.
Mrs. A. N. Winslow, Mass.

Members of the Executive Committee
Mrs. William Jennings Bryan, Neb.
Mrs. Walter Cope, Pa.
Miss Helena Dudley, Mass.
Mrs. Frederick Holt, Mich.
Mrs. David Starr Jordan, Calif.
Mrs. Eleanor Daggett Karsten, N. Y.
Mrs. Florence Kelley, N. Y.
Mrs. William Kent, Calif.
Mrs. Anna Rhoads Ladd, Pa.
Mrs. Henry G. Leach, N. Y.
Mrs. Lola Maverick Lloyd, Ill.
Mrs. Lucia Ames Mead, Mass.
Miss Rose Standish Nichols, Mass.
Mrs. George Odell, Wash., D. C.
Miss Juliet Poyntz, N. Y.
Mrs. Frederick J. Taussig, Mo.
Mrs. Mary Church Terrell, Wash., D. C.
Mrs. John Jay White, Wash., D. C.
Miss Ellen Winsor, Pa.

STANDING COMMITTEES:

Fight the Famine Crusade
Education—Sub-committee on Physical Education
League of Nations
Oriental Relations
Universal Free Trade
Citizenship: to permeate the Americanization Movement with the spirit of Internationalism
Pan-American Relations
Labor
Legislation, Chairman, Mrs. George Odell, 1623 H St., Washington, D. C.
Finance, Chairman, Mrs. Marion B. Cothren, 144 East 40th St., N. Y.

All American women are urged to join this Section for U. S. A. of the Women's International League by use of the appended slip.

Date.....

I hereby enclose one dollar for membership in the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Section for U. S. A., for the year 1920.

Name..... Address.....

I also enclose $..... as contribution to the work of the organization.

I wish to help in the work of the following committee.....

Make checks payable to W.I.L.P.F., Section for U. S. A., and send to Eleanor Daggett Karsten, Exec. Sec'y, Room 1616, 33 W. 42d St., N.Y. C.